1 2 3 4	MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP Brian P. Murray 275 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10016 Telephone: (212) 682-1818 Facsimile: (212) 682-1892 bmurray@murrayfrank.com			
5 6 7 8 9	EMERSON POYNTER LLP John G. Emerson Scott E. Poynter Christopher D. Jennings 500 President Clinton Avenue, Suite 305 Little Rock, AR 72201 Telephone: (501) 907-2555 Facsimile: (501) 907-2556 jemerson@emersonpoynter.com scott@emersonpoynter.com cjennings@emersonpoynter.com			
11	Counsel for Plaintiff			
12 13 14 15 16	DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL James H.R. Windels Brooke A. Grossman 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 Telephone: (212) 450-4000 brooke.grossman@dpw.com james.windels@dpw.com Counsel for Defendant	TEC D	JETDICT COUDT	
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
19				
20	SAN	JOSE I	DIVISION	
21	HERBERT FRANCL, Derivatively on Behalf of RAMBUS INC.,)	File No. C-08-1315-JF	
22	Plaintiff,)		
23	v.)	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	
24	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS,)		
25	Defendant,)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED	
26)		
27				
28				

||`

The parties to the above-titled action jointly submit this Case Management Conference Statement.

1. Jurisdiction and Service

Plaintiff alleges that the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(2) in that Plaintiff and Defendant are citizens of different states and the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs. Defendant PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP ("PwC" or "Defendant") was served with the complaint filed in this action on August 29, 2007.

2. Facts

This is a shareholder derivative action brought on behalf of nominal defendant Rambus, Inc. ("Rambus" or the "Company") against PwC for alleged breach of contract and professional negligence and malpractice, in connection with Rambus's alleged improper grant of and accounting for stock options. Plaintiff alleges that PwC allowed Rambus insiders to divert millions of dollars of corporate assets to themselves via the manipulation of the grant dates associated with options awarded to insiders to purchase hundreds of thousands of shares of Rambus stock – a scheme referred to as "back-dating." PwC contends that it complied with all of its contractual and professional obligations in performing its audits of Rambus's financial statements and, as publicly reported by Rambus, was provided by Rambus with falsified information regarding options grants.

On October 19, 2006, Rambus announced the completion of its internal investigation of its historical option grants. Rambus announced that certain stock option grants had been incorrectly dated or accounted for under applicable accounting rules; as a result, the Company

expected to restate its historical financial statements. The Company ultimately restated its earnings by \$102.4 million.

On August 28, 2007, Plaintiff Herbert Francl filed in the Southern District of New York a shareholder derivative action on behalf of Rambus, asserting claims against PwC. On November 21, 2007, the case was transferred to this District; a Case Management Conference was subsequently scheduled for July 11, 2008.

Plaintiff alleges that PwC breached written contracts between PwC and the Company and committed professional negligence and malpractice by allowing the improper misdating of certain grants of Rambus stock options to Company insiders, substantially damaging the Company. Plaintiff further alleges that Rambus will suffer additional loss in the form of investigation and restatement costs, increased financing costs, adverse tax consequences, possible civil and/or criminal penalties, and revenue losses. PwC denies any allegations of wrongdoing or liability.

3. Legal Issues

The principal legal issues currently in dispute are: (1) whether PwC breached its contractual obligations; (2) whether PwC failed to perform its duties in a professional manner, using the degree of care normally used and expected in the accounting and auditing profession; (3) whether Rambus is entitled to damages and/or equitable relief as a result of Defendant's alleged misconduct; and (4) whether Plaintiff made a demand on Rambus's Board of Directors or whether a pre-suit demand on Rambus's Board of Directors is excused in this action.

4. Motions

No motions are pending. Defendant anticipates filing a Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint within 60 days of its filing.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

5. Amendment of Pleadings

Plaintiff anticipates filing an Amended Complaint on or before August 28, 2008.

6. Evidence Preservation

Plaintiff has taken all necessary steps to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action, and will not destroy any documents or other evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action, to the extent such evidence is in his possession.

7. Disclosures

Neither party has made initial disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26; the parties believe that such disclosures should proceed in due course.

8. Discovery

Plaintiff has not demanded discovery from Defendant, but believes that discovery should proceed in due course. PwC believes discovery should be stayed pending resolution of the motion to dismiss.

9. Class Actions

This action is not a class action.

10. Related Cases

In re Rambus Inc. Derivative Litig., No. C-06-3513-JF, pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, in some respects overlaps factually with this litigation, but Plaintiff contends that the present litigation alleges different legal theories against different defendants.

11. Relief

The amount of damages cannot be calculated at this time, although Plaintiff believes that the Company has suffered substantial damages.

1

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

12. **Settlement and ADR**

The parties are filing contemporaneously herewith a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference and will file their respective ADR Certifications as soon as practicable. The parties agree that ADR would not be helpful at this time and that any ADR procedure should be stayed pending resolution of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes

The parties do not consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings including trial and entry of judgment.

14. **Other References**

The parties do not believe that this case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

15. Narrowing of Issues

The parties do not believe that any issues can be narrowed at this early stage of the litigation.

16. Expedited Schedule

The parties do not believe this is the type of case that can be handled on an expedited basis.

17. Scheduling

The parties believe that the following schedule is appropriate for filing of the Amended Complaint and briefing of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss:

Event	<u>Deadline</u>
Amended Complaint	August 28, 2008
Motion to Dismiss	October 27, 2008

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	
1	3
	3 4
1	
1	4
1 1 1	4 5
1 1 1	4 5 6

Opposition to Motion to Dismiss	December 11, 2008
Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss	January 2, 2009

18. Trial

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury and expect that a trial of this case will require approximately 20 days.

19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

Neither party has filed the "Certification of Interested Entities or Person" required by Civil Local Rule 3-16.

20. Miscellaneous

The parties do not know at this time of any other matters that will facilitate the just, speedy and inexpensive disposition of this matter.

The parties reserve the right to seek Court modification of this Order.

Dated: July 10, 2008 Respectfully Submitted,

MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP

/s/ Brian P. Murray
Brian P. Murray
275 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 682-1818
Facsimile: (212) 682-1892
bmurray@murrayfrank.com

EMERSON POYNTER LLP

John G. Emerson

Scott E. Poynter
Christopher D. Jennings
500 President Clinton Avenue, Suite 305
Little Rock, AR 72201
Telephone: (501) 907-2555
Facsimile: (501) 907-2556
jemerson@emersonpoynter.com
scott@emersonpoynter.com
cjennings@emersonpoynter.com
Counsel for Plaintiff

28

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Dated: July 10, 2008

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL

/s/ James H.R. Windels_

James H.R. Windels Brooke A. Grossman 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 Telephone: (212) 450-4000 brooke.grossman@dpw.com james.windels@dpw.com Counsel for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 10, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I have mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List.

/s/ Brian P. Murray_

Brian P. Murray MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP 275 Madison Avenue, Suite 801 New York, NY 10016

Telephone: (212) 682-1818 Facsimile: (212) 682-1892 bmurray@murrayfrank.com

Mailing Information for a Case 5:08-cv-01315-JF

Electronic Mail Notice List

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

John G. Emerson

jemers on @emers on poynter.com, tanya @emers on poynter.com, wilson @emers on poynter.com, cjennings @emers on poynter.com, michelle @emers on poynter.com,

• Brooke A. Grossman

brooke.grossman@dpw.com

• Brian P Murray

bmurray@murrayfrank.com

• James H.R. Windels

james.windels@dpw.com

Manual Notice List

The following is the list of attorneys who are not

on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

Christopher D. Jennings

Emerson Poynter LLP - Little Rock The Museum Center 500 President Clinton Avenue Suite 305 Little Rock, AR 72201

Scott E. Poynter

Emerson Poynter LLP The Museum Center 500 President Clinton Ave., Ste 305 Little Rock, AR 72201

1 of 1 7/10/2008 4:47 PM